

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 9.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 4, 1809.

[Price 10d.]

"A cowardice, too, of the *basest* kind, participating of the most depraved and odious qualities, deserving of that execration which the best feelings of humanity would pronounce on the *base assailant* of female weakness."—MR. CANNING, in the Debate of 27th Jan. 1809.

321]

[322

DUKE OF YORK.

(Continued from page 314.)

BEFORE I proceed with my Analysis of the cases, I shall offer some observations, upon the *Letter*, with which the Duke of York has treated the House of Commons and the public; but, previous even to those observations I feel myself called upon to notice the re-examination of *Miss Taylor*, who, as the reader will recollect, was a principal witness in the case of French and Sandon's levy, and whose testimony, he will also recollect, remained unshaken, up to that part inclusive, which was wrought into the analysis of the case, in my last number.—This re-examination appears to have arisen from a man of the name of *Frederick Schmidt*, or *Smith*, having given information to some one, that *Miss Taylor's* father was, at one time, called *Chance*; and, from a discovery, which had been made, that she was not a legitimate child; that her father and mother were not married. I shall now give this re-examination as I find it reported, including the intervening observations of the several members, who spoke upon it.

By MR. BRADSHAW.

Do you recollect your paternal grandfather?—I do not, he was dead before I was born.

Might not your father have taken the name of *CHANCE* without your knowledge, and from pecuniary embarrassments?—How then should I know it.

By MR. PERCEVAL.

Is your father alive?—He is.

Has not your mother been confined under an execution for debt in the Fleet prison? [The witness, much agitated, drew back from the bar, with these expressions—"My mother's misfortunes have nothing to do with the object of the present Inquiry."]]

Has not your mother been in custody for debt?

Witness. I appeal to the protection of the Chair.

MR. WHARTON. "It is my duty to call

upon you for an answer to the last question."

After some moments the witness, in tears, replied—Yes.

How long was she confined?—Two years.

The witness was ordered to withdraw.

MR. PERCEVAL stated that gentlemen opposite, when ready to depreciate his mode of examination, appeared to forget that the witness had represented herself, in her former examination, as the *legitimate daughter of married parents*, although it was now clear, by the imprisonment of her mother, that she never was married to the father of *Miss Taylor*.

MR. W. SMITH did dislike the tenor of the examination which was followed by the opposite side. It had in the previous part a tendency to cast imputations upon the character of the witness herself; but, that having failed, her *veracity* was to be questioned, because she had the misfortune to be the offspring of an illicit connexion. Her delicacy in endeavouring to conceal that circumstance, in his opinion, instead of weakening, strengthened her yet unshaken claims to credit.

MR. WHITBREAD considered the question for the decision of the Committee was not, whether *Miss Taylor's* birth was respectable, but whether her testimony was credible? Besides, he believed the Chancellor of the Exchequer had assumed more than the evidence would justify, when he asserted that *Miss Taylor* had represented herself to the Committee as the daughter of married parents.—Her former evidence was then read, and it appeared that no such statement was made by her.

SIR JOHN SEBRIGHT declared, that the impression which the first answer of the witness, on her former examination, namely, that she was the daughter of a gentleman, made on his mind, was, that she was an illegitimate child.

MR. W. WYNNE said, it was not to be endured, that because, from an amiable reluctance, the explanation of the witness

L

did not run before decorum and sensibility, that, therefore, a suspicion was to be entertained of her veracity.

MR. BARHAM. Really this is an attempt to discredit a correct witness, not upon her own testimony, but upon the errors of her parents.

Frederick Shmidt, upon being examined and cross-examined, gave no testimony, that Miss Taylor ever knew that her father went, upon any occasion, by the name of Chance; so that, there was nothing new came out, which did not tend to confirm, rather than to weaken, her former claims to credibility. In her former evidence, she did *not* say that she was a legitimate child; she did *not* say, that her father and mother were married; but, suppose she had said so; good God! would that have impeached her general veracity? Because she, whose very bread depended so much upon the character of her connections; who had a sister keeping a boarding-school, in partnership with herself; who had two brothers in the naval and three in the military service, all bearing commissions; was her general veracity to be impeached, because she did not state, because she disguised, a fact not at all connected with the matter upon which she was examined, and a fact, the proclaiming of which must, at once, greatly injure, not only herself, but her father, mother, sister, and brothers?—It is but justice to the House of Commons to say, that they do appear to have received, with great applause, the sentiments of Mr. Smith, Mr. Whitbread, Sir J. Sebright, Mr. Wynne and Mr. Barham; and, in this respect, at least, the voice of the country is decidedly with that of the House. There is but one sentiment upon this subject. The treatment of Miss Taylor is in the mouth of every person, who talks upon matters connected with the inquiry. The press, with the sole exception, I believe, of the *Nabobs' Gazette*, has been unanimous in endeavours to do her justice; and, I do hope, that, when the affair is all over, if she shall still be found to have adhered to the truth, the public will consider the ruin, to which she has been exposed, and will yield her other protection than that which is given by words; for, as far as I am able to judge, an object more worthy of compassion and of support never presented itself to the people of this kingdom, who, whatever faults they may have, do not number amongst them that of a want of compassion, or of justice towards the injured.

The Letter of the Duke of York, to the House of Commons, we must first insert. It is a document of a very curious nature, and the proceedings upon it must, and will, be, in the end, of the greatest consequence to the country. —“To the Speaker of the House of Commons.—“Horse Guards, February 23rd, 1809.—“Sir, I have waited with the greatest anxiety until the Committee appointed by the House of Commons to inquire into my conduct, as Commander in Chief of his Majesty's Army, had closed its examinations, and I now hope that it will not be deemed improper to address this letter, through you, to the House of Commons.—I observe with the deepest concern, that in the course of this inquiry, my name has been coupled with transactions *the most criminal and disgraceful*, and I must ever regret and lament, that a connection should ever have existed, which has thus exposed my character and honour to public animadversion.—With respect to my alledged offences, connected with the discharge of my official duties, I do, in the most solemn manner, *upon my honour, as a prince*, distinctly assert my innocence, not only by denying all corrupt participation in any of the *infamous* transactions which have appeared in evidence at the bar of the House of Commons, or any connivance at their existence, but also the *slightest knowledge or suspicion* that they existed at all.—My consciousness of innocence leads me *confidently* to hope, that the House of Commons will not, upon *such* evidence as they have heard, adopt *any proceeding prejudicial to my honour and character*; but if, on *such* testimony as has been adduced against me, the House of Commons *can* think my innocence *questionable*, I claim of their justice, that I shall not be condemned *without trial*, or be deprived of the benefit and protection which is afforded to every British subject, by *those sanctions* under which alone evidence is received in the ordinary administration of the law.—I am, Sir, your's, &c.—FREDERICK.”—Now, I will venture to assert, that, of the fourteen millions of people, of which this nation consists, there is not one, except those who are the advisers of the Duke of York, who would have expected, under such circumstances, such a letter from him. It really would appear, that he looks upon the evidence that has been given against him as being discredited, not

only by the House, but by the country ; and, that his simple denial, upon his "*honour, as a prince,*" is quite sufficient to do away the effect of all that has passed in the House of Commons, within the last interesting month. Here we have a most striking instance of the blinding effects of long-enjoyed power, and long-continued flattery. A person, so circumstanced, does not see with the eyes, or hear with the ears, of men whom no one has an interest in deceiving. Blessed advisers he must have, who, while such a mass of positive and corroborated and strongly presumptive evidence lay against him, took up his pen to give it a simple negation, upon his bare word ; who, in the face of his two letters, wherein Clavering's application is mentioned, and wherein, in consequence of a request of Mrs. Clarke, it is stated that he will endeavour to procure O'Meara an opportunity of preaching before royalty ; who, in the face of these letters, tells the House of Commons, that he never had "*the slightest knowledge or suspicion,*" that these corruptions existed at all. Blessed advisers that man must have, especially after the inquiry into the origin of the short note respecting Tonyn's promotion, and which note does, at last, set at defiance all the attempts to make it out "*a forgery.*" Blessed advisers, to say, in the face of all this, that he never had even a "*suspicion*" that such things existed ; and to appear "*confident,*" that, in consequence of this bare assertion, upon "*the honour of a prince,*" the House of Commons should, with their month's examinations of witnesses before them, stop short, in a moment ; or, at least, that they should come to no decision, upon that evidence, prejudicial to his honour and character ! Blessed advisers that man must have !—Why, upon reading this assertion, as opposed to the evidence taken at the bar of the House, the observation that starts from every mouth, is this : "*Oh ! then, why was there any inquiry at all ?*" If the Duke's assertion, upon his "*honour as a prince,*" be sufficient to knock down all this evidence, why not have appealed to that word, when Mr. Wardle brought forward his charges ? And why not have brought the Duke's denial ; the Duke's "*distinct assertion,*" to set against Mr. Wardle and his charges, and thereupon, voted the charges to be false and malicious, and the work of a Jacobinical conspiracy against the "*illustrious House of Brunswick ?*"—But, has been contended, that there is

nothing, in this letter, trenching upon the privileges of the House ; no attempt to deter them from proceeding, in their own way, with respect to the charges and evidence against the Duke. Mr. Whitbread, on the day after the letter had been read to the House, spoke of it as an attack upon its privileges, and observed, that the Duke might as well have written a letter to the House before any proceedings had taken place, asserting his innocence, and suggesting, that they ought not to proceed.—Mr. Perceval denied this, and said, that the Duke merely asserted his innocence, and requested that, should that innocence still be doubted, he might be allowed to go to trial, without any further previous proceedings against him ; and that he (Mr. Perceval) saw nothing unconstitutional or improper in this.—No ? Well said, Mr. Perceval ! It may be "*constitutional,*" for that is a very accommodating word ; and, it may be "*proper*" too ; but, if the letter has any meaning at all in it, it is this ; that the House will do wrong, that they will be guilty of an act of injustice, if they take any step in the business, prejudicial to the Duke ; and, that, at most, they ought to leave his conduct to be judged of by others than themselves. This, indeed, is admitted by Mr. Perceval ; it cannot be denied ; and, if this be not dictating to the House what they ought, or rather, what they ought not, to do, I know not the meaning of the word *dictate*. There may have been letters, sent, by accused persons, to the House of Commons ; but, I defy Mr. Perceval to produce an instance of such a letter as this ; a letter, expressing a "*confident hope,*" that the House, who have taken evidence upon the case, will not, to the prejudice of the accused, proceed to any step, grounded upon that evidence.—Then, observe, the whole of the evidence, taken by the House, and many parts of which great numbers of the members have expressly declared to be unshaken ; the whole of this evidence, in a lump, not excepting even that contained in his own letters and note, is branded as false by the party accused. He presumes, before the summing up has taken place in the House, to tell them how they ought to decide upon the quality of the evidence ; he, upon his bare word, and without pretending to possess the means of proving what he says, takes upon him to tell the House, that they ought to regard as a liar every person, who has given evidence against him.—Nay, he further presumes to say, that, if the House

can believe the accusatory evidence; if they can think his innocence *questionable*; what then? What is then contingently pointed out to them? Why, to leave him to be tried elsewhere; and, in the meanwhile, not to adopt *any* proceeding, prejudicial to his honour and character. Now, it will be recollected, that, in other cases of impeachment, the House have, the moment they found *cause* for impeachment, addressed the king to remove the accused persons from his councils and presence, and especially from any places of *trust*, or *command*, that they possessed at the time; all, or any one, of which, the Duke has now the modesty to "*confidently hope*," that they will not attempt to do, in this *his* particular case, notwithstanding all the evidence that they have before them; and this "*confident hope*" he expresses, too, at the same time, that he talks so fluently of the protection afforded to *every other* British subject.—That, upon this occasion, all possible delicacy towards the king should be shown, I am quite willing to allow. It is enough in all conscience for a father to know that such grounds of charge exist against his son, without being told any thing about them in a harsh manner. An address for removal from his presence for ever, or at all, would sound hard; but, from *employment* and *councils*, until a final decision take place, is what reason, is what the necessity of the case points out. Indeed, what must those advisers be, who would render *even* this necessary? Perhaps they will not. To *lay the evidence before the king* seems to be the *first step*; and then to wait to see, whether any further step be required.—One cannot, however, make these observations, without suffering to intrude the reflection of how dangerous it is to place members of the royal family in *responsible* situations. It is true, that, in the eye of the law, the Duke of York is no more than a *subject* of the king; but, let law, and even philosophy, say what they will, the practice will set their maxims and their principles at defiance.—Reader, has it not struck you as a question to be asked, How the Duke, who appears to be so full of that "*conscious innocence*," of which the Nabobs' Gazette speaks, came to think it necessary; how he, who so boldly asserts his innocence, and who seems to hold the evidence against him in such hearty confidence, how he came to think it at all necessary to tell the House, that he hoped they would not adopt any proceeding prejudicial to his honour? Why should he sup-

pose they would? How came such a thought into that head of his? It seems to me, that if I had been in his place, and conscious of innocence and contemning the evidence against me, I should have let my judges alone to acquit me, in their own good time and manner. If, indeed, I have evidence on my side to produce; then, I say, "*wait; hear me too, before you decide*;" but, the Duke has produced all his evidence. A whole levy, an army, of lawyers and attorneys have been at work for him, during the whole of the proceedings, which, at last, closed with the examination of General Officers (*members of the House, too*) as to his talents and industry in the disciplining of the army. He does not ask to be heard; he does not even pretend that he has any thing to produce in his defence; he merely brands all the evidence against him as falsehoods, and, as the *Courier* (which has acted a most manly part in these times) well observes, "*desires complete acquittal without producing any evidence other than mere assertion*."—Well, but how came he to think an expression of his "*confident hope*" necessary? It is not; I think, too much to presume, that the answer to this question must be to this amount, namely, *that he thought it probable, at the least, that the House looked upon the evidence in a light different from that, in which he viewed it*; for, unless he thus thought, it is evident, that he would not have written a letter, containing words expressive of such a hope; and, if this be our conclusion, it necessarily follows, that we must believe, that the letter was intended to induce the House to come over to his way of thinking, or to the opinion expressed by him, relative to that evidence. The main point for the reader to consider here, however, is, how far this running before his judges, in their decision upon the evidence, corresponds with that solemn assertion of "*innocence*," contained in the letter. This is the point for the public to consider. The inquiry had been gone through. Every thing that could be produced, on the side of the accused, had been produced. There had been no want of advisers, or of assistants, of any sort, of any size. The whole case was before the House, and, owing to the Duke's friends, before the public also. It was, appears to me, the part of "*conscious innocence*" to wait, with impatience, in doubt; but with confidence, for the decision; and not to run before the judges with a request, that they would come to no decision at all, or, at least to no other



decision than that of an acquittal. This is not the part usually acted by "conscious innocence."—Extraordinary as the whole of the letter is, the close has still so much of this quality in it as to make it a conspicuous object even in such a group of extraordinary propositions. The Duke claims of the justice of the House, that he shall not be condemned without a trial, or be "deprived of the benefit and protection which is" [are he means] "afforded to every British subject, by those sanctions, under which alone, evidence is received in the ordinary administration of law."

—By "those sanctions," he means oaths, I suppose; and then, the first observation to make, is, that the evidence in his favour, as well as that against him, has not been taken upon oath.—The House of Commons is in the habit of taking evidence in this way, and in deciding upon it too; and, there appears to be no sound reason, why the Duke of York should be exempted from the effect of its power in this respect.

—But, that which is most striking here, is, that the mode which has been adopted, in the inquiry, is the very mode pointed out by his friends, in opposition to the mode pointed out by Mr. Wardle, who, to his immortal honour, brought forward the charges, and who, after having preferred the Charges, moved for the appointment of a committee to inquire into them, and, before a committee, so appointed, the witnesses would have been examined upon oath. Mr. ADAM opposed this, and conjured the House not to appoint a committee of this sort, but to have the inquiry open at the bar. He said (see page 199 of this Vol.) that, "in justice to its own privileges and to the dignified character of the illustrious personage, the House ought not to surrender its inquisitorial powers, nor delegate to any Select or Secret Committee that inquiry, which to be efficient, must be public, and for the publicity of which there was no person more anxious than the Duke of York."—Mr. WILBERFORCE wished for a committee, capable of examining the witnesses upon oath.—Mr. PERCEVAL was for an inquiry at the bar of the House; and he said (see page 200), that "some consideration ought to be extended to the wish of his Royal Highness. That wish, he could positively state, was that the investigation should be the most complete and public. (hear! hear! hear!) There was nothing that his royal highness so particularly deprecated as any secret or close discussion of those charges. Standing, as that illustrious personage did, on

"the fairness of his character, and the fulness of the evidence which he was enabled to produce, he was desirous of being acquitted by the most public investigation."

—Lord FOLKESTONE wished for a select committee, seeing how difficult a matter it was to carry on a fair inquiry at the bar of the House.—Mr. CANNING was for the examination at the bar; he said that the history of parliament was replete with precedents for it; and, he called it "a species of trial which united earliness with publicity."—Thus, was this mode of inquiry, upon the suggestion of Mr. ADAM, the twenty years gratuitous adviser of the Duke, adopted, in opposition to the course pointed out and moved for by Mr. Wardle; and, the Chancellor of the Exchequer states positively, that it is this mode of inquiry, that the Duke of York wishes for.

—Well, he has had his wish. The inquiry is over. It has taken place. It is closed.

And, what does he now, in his own name, and under his own hand, tell this same House of Commons? Why, that he has, thus far, been "deprived;" aye "deprived," of what Mr. Wardle and Mr. Wilberforce and Lord Folkestone, contrary to his wishes, expressed by Mr. Perceval, wanted him to have; and, upon the ground of this deprivation, amongst other grounds, he desires the House not to adopt any proceeding prejudicial to his honour; though he appears to have no sort of objection to their acquitting him. This, I think, does very far surpass every thing of the sort that I ever heard of in all my life. I have seen many remarkable instances of the presumption of power; but any thing like this, or nearly approaching a resemblance to it, I never before witnessed.—

The Duke's wish, the wish of the accused, prevailed over that of the accuser. The accused has had the mode of trial which he chose; and now the trial is over, he seems to think it no trial at all, unless the decision shall be that of acquittal. Upon evidence, not taken upon oath, he is willing to be acquitted; but, he is not willing to be condemned without "a trial." Why, Mr. Canning called this a species of trial; but it was not called a trial for acquittal only.—Let us look upon the thing on the other side. Suppose the House had found no evidence in support of the charges; would they not instantly have voted the charges false and groundless, and accused the accusers of infamous calumny? To be sure they would; and, are we to be told, that they ought not now to condemn, or censure; that they ought not now to adopt

proceedings prejudicial to the honour of the accused, upon the evidence received in the same way? If they were *now* to acquit the Duke, and any one of us were to tell them that they had done wrong, would they not send us to Newgate for a gross breach of their privileges? Oh, God! it makes one's flesh creep upon one's bones.—They may acquit, but they cannot condemn. A strange court indeed, this! Mr. Canning talked of the House in its *judicial* capacity; but he certainly had no idea of this sort. Mr. Perceval talked of *acquittal*, or of *condemnation*; Mr. Canning again talked of *infamy* upon the head of the *accused* or the *accuser*, as the necessary result of the inquiry; but, if we adopt the doctrine of the Duke's letter, the only person in danger of infamy was the *accuser*.—People of England, you who pay the taxes, and you who are to fight for your country, have your eyes steadily fixed upon what is now doing in the House of Commons.

Seeing that, at the present moment, the *whole of the case*, of the Duke of York, is fresh in the public mind, I think it will be best to defer a continuation of my analysis of the separate cases, 'till we have taken time to examine some very important matter, that presses forward for observation, connected with what appears to be, by some, regarded as a *set-off* to the charges and evidence.—During the examinations, Colonel Gordon was frequently asked questions touching the excellence of the Duke's regulations as to promotions, and so forth; and as to the good effect, which they were calculated to have upon the discipline and efficiency of the army. The Colonel's answers, were, all through, calculated to produce a great idea of the good, which had been done, owing to the Duke of York being Commander in Chief.—When the whole of the examinations, at all *relating to the charges*, had been gone through, recourse was had to the evidence of general officers, who were members of the House, in order to shew how much benefit the army had derived from the chief commandership of the Duke of York.—Now, before we enter upon this part of the interesting scene, let us ask, *why* this sort of evidence? why evidence as to the discipline and state of the army was called for, in a case, where the charges were of *corruption*? If a shepherd be tried for sheep-stealing, is evidence ever brought respecting the healthy and excellent state of the flock? The fact about the *stealing* is the

only thing to be inquired into in such a case. It has always a bad look to see an accused person, or the advocates of an accused person, *fly off* from the point at issue. Meet that point first. Get a decision upon that; and then urge your claims upon other accounts. When you accuse any one of being a *liar*, and he answers, "I am no *thief*," all the hearers know very well what to conclude as to the charge of his being a liar.—Now for this famous evidence, the task of bringing out which was undertaken by Mr. CHARLES YORKE, General NORTON was asked, whether "the army had been improved, or not, since the Duke of York had had the chief command;" to which he answered, "I think the discipline was as good before the Duke of York had the command." Being asked nearly the same question again, he answers: "I should suppose it may have improved. Still, I think, the troops were as good in General Wolfe's time."—Sir JAMES PULTENEY said, that "the condition of the army had improved; that the discipline had improved; that the facility of manœuvring had been greatly improved, since the Duke of York took the command."—Sir ARTHUR WELLESLEY corroborated the evidence of Sir James Pulteney, and added this very striking part of his statement: "I know that his royal highness has given general satisfaction in the promotion of officers, and I have never found that he *departed from any rule laid down for a promotion in the army*."—General FITZPATRICK said, that the good which the army had derived from the command of his royal highness was so great, as well as so notorious, that any appeal, upon the subject, to general officers, was unnecessary.—Now, first as to *discipline*, where have we, in the experience, any proof of such improvements? Discipline, like every thing else, ought to be estimated by the effects which we see it produce.—Dunkirk, the Helder, Ferrol, Buenos Ayres, Cintra, Galicia, &c. &c.! Aye, very true! There may have been *no fault* in either case; but, still, the excellence of armies is proved by their victories, and by their victories *only*. Why have we so high an opinion of our fleet? *Only* because it is so constantly victorious. Read the account below of the actions of Lord Cochrane*. Do we hear of such things

* The GERONA Gazette of Jan. 4, in inserting a letter from his lordship to the Junta of that city, pays the following tri-

in our army? Not that I would cast a reflection upon the officers of the army, many of whom are, doubtless, made of as good stuff as Lord Cochrane, and had they had his naval education, would have been doing what he is doing; but, what I say is this, that we must judge of the excellence of an army as we do of the excellence of a fleet, and that is *by its deeds*. And this, I beg the reader to observe, was the principle, upon which Sir Arthur Wellesley first met the charges against the Duke. He then said, that the victory of Vimiera was owing to the excellent state of the army, and that the House in thanking him for that victory, was in fact, though indirectly, thanking the Duke of York also. Now, then, pray let the argument be as good on the one side as it is on the other. If the Duke is to be thanked for the victories, pray let him have his share of the blame for the defeats. Sir Arthur does not appear to have been aware, that he had got hold of a two-edged argument; but, it does not follow that no one else should perceive it.

Discipline, in the view of some people, seems to mean nothing more than the regulations respecting the movements upon parade, or at a field-day. The dressing to right and left; the quick and slow step; the locking up and the opening of ranks; the wheeling and facing and the tossing of

bute to his conduct.——“This gallant Englishman has been entitled to the admiration and gratitude of this country, from the first moment of its political resurrection. His generosity in co-operating with our earliest efforts, the encouragement we received from the interest he took with the Commanders of the Balearic Islands to induce them to succour us with troops and ammunition, can never be erased from our recollection. The extraordinary services which we owe to his indefatigable activity, particularly this city and the adjacent coast, in protecting us from the attempts of the enemy, are too well known to be repeated here.—It is a sufficient culogium upon his character to mention, that in the defence of the Castle of Trinidad, when the Spanish flag, hoisted on the wall, fell into the ditch, under a most dreadful fire from the enemy, his Lordship was the only person who, regardless of the shower of balls flying about him, descended into the ditch, returned with the flag, and happily succeeded in placing it where it was before.”

the firelock; the queuing of hair and the polishing of arms and accoutrements. Why, these are the science of drill-serjeants, hundreds of whom there are, who would beat even the Duke of York at any branch of these important affairs, which are all forgotten the moment an army takes the field, and which serve merely to fill up the leisure hours of officers and soldiers, when they have no real military duty to perform. They are most of them very proper; but, they have nothing to do with what, in a comprehensive mind, is viewed as the *discipline* of an army, which consists in great and general regulations, relating to obedience, to the administration of justice, to the talents and experience of commanders, to the distribution of duty and of power, all which require much experience as well as much reflection, much solidity of head as well as much integrity of heart. To hear Sir James Pulteney, upon a question of *discipline*, talk of the putting six regiments together *to manœuvre*, is truly astonishing. This has nothing to do with the discipline of an army, any more than with the House in Gloucester-place.——But, even in point of look, of mere parade look, and movement, I put it to any man, who can bring his mind back to what the army was 20 years ago, to say whether it has, even in this respect, improved. In the year 1789 I remember seeing the Sixth Regiment of foot, in New Brunswick, and I have never seen such a regiment since that time. I saw the 12th regt. of foot about the year 1785; they had no Austrian caps on, no black leggings, and no short face-less coats. They had the old grenadier caps and the old battalion hats; except on duty, they wore any coloured stockings, and any sort of buckles; their coats had good warm skirts to them, and they were not much of the tight and truss-looking sort. They were commanded by old Major Picton, who had, I believe, been a private in the regiment, in which the present General Picton was then a lieutenant of grenadiers. But, with all this old-fashioned work about them, they were the finest regiment I ever saw in my life; and, during about a year that I knew them, I do not believe, that there were above two men punished at the halberts. Will any man persuade me, then, that such a regt. as the 12th was then, would not have been as efficient in the field as if they had been screwed up in tight Austrian jerkins? It must be allowed, that the very great augmentation of its num-

bers has rendered it impossible to keep the army what it formerly was, either in point of morals, or of the size of the men. This I am willing to allow; but, really, when, on the one hand, I see the poor dirty looking things that now wear, after the German fashion, sashes twisted round them every day in the week; and, on the other hand, look back to the sergeants of 20 years ago, I am astonished to hear any one say that the army has *improved*. Still, I do allow, that it is quite impossible to have so large an army what the army was, and what it might be again if reduced to 50,000 men. I do not blame the Duke of York, because the army is not now what it then was; nor do I blame him because 12 or 15 thousand officers are not so select as 2 thousand officers were; but, I greatly blame his friends for endeavouring to make us believe, that the army formerly was bad, compared to what it is now, which I say is not the fact, and which, from the nature of things, cannot be the fact.—But, something has been said about the Duke having bettered the *condition* of the soldier. I have no wish to deny him a disposition to render the soldier's lot more comfortable, nor the merit of having taken a proper part in any measure of that sort; but, I believe, no one will deny, that the augmentation of pay was absolutely necessary to the bare existence of the men; the *time* when the augmentation took place must, too, not be forgotten; and, at any rate, the *means* came out of the pocket of the public and not of the Duke of York. Still, however, I do not wish to withhold from him any part of the praise due to this consideration for the then wretched state of the soldier; but, I must insist, and I am pretty sure, that the public will be of my opinion, that let who would have been the chief commander of the army, the pay, at the time referred to, must have been augmented, or that starvation, absolute starvation, would have driven the men from the ranks. Then, again, who will venture to assert, or to suppose, that what has been done for the comfort of the soldier, would not have been done under *any other* commander in chief? When the salaries of the Judges were augmented, did they receive the augmentation as a boon, as a *gift* from the *minister* of the day? No; but as an act of justice at the hands of the country; as something due to their services and their rank; as no more than a just compensation for the use of their great talents, and for their arduous and almost unremitted

labours. It is not at all agreeable to my notions, nor, I hope, to the notions either of those who pay, or those who receive, to look upon what is given in the way of augmentation to the income of any servant of the public, as a gift on the part of those, be they who they may, that propose, or support, the making of that augmentation.—Now, we come to a part of this evidence, which has some slight bearing upon the charges before the House, namely, what Sir Arthur Wellesley says about that “great and general satisfaction which the Duke has given as to matters of *promotion*, and about his inflexible adherence to the *rules* laid down relating to *promotions*.” This is all very well, but the worst of it is, that we have the cases of *Captain Maling* and of *Sammy Carter* before us; not in hearsay, not in assertion, but in *proof*. *Sammy* we will leave till another time; but, there is a part of Colonel Gordon's evidence (for reminding me of which I am obliged to some very acute and excellent remarks in the *Courier*) which we must here take particular notice of, as it will, in a twinkling, give us a most correct idea of all this boasted *regularity* and *inflexibility* about promotions.

(Page 47). Colonel GORDON says, I conceive it *my particular duty* to take care and report to the Commander in Chief, that any Officer whose name is submitted to his Royal Highness is a fit and proper person, duly qualified in all respects as to character, as to *points of service*, and as to his Majesty's regulations for the service into which he is so recommended.

It is a regulation of the army, his Majesty's regulation, that no Subaltern can be promoted to a *company*, either by purchase or without, under a *service* of two years.

(Page 49, he says) The regulations are briefly these: an officer must *serve* as a Subaltern two years before he can be a *Captain*, and he must have *served* six years before he can be a Field Officer. *I never knew an instance of those rules being broken through, always, as in merchants accounts, saying errors excepted.*

(Page 53, to Col. GORDON). Has it ever come within your knowledge, that any officer has been promoted *without any service* whatever? *No, it has not.*

(Page 55, to Col. GORDON). What were the *services* of Captain Maling's brother, who is, I believe, a Captain in the army, who is in the War Office? There is a Captain Maling, an assistant of mine in the Office of the Commander in Chief; I

take it for granted, that is the person referred to. What his services are as a Lieutenant, *I really do not know*; I found him as a Lieutenant in the Office of the Commander in Chief; and in consideration of his extraordinary good character, and more than common abilities, the promotions of the army going through his hands, under mine, *I did recommend him* to his Royal Highness the Commander in Chief to be placed upon the half-pay as a Captain, upon which half-pay *he most assuredly* will be placed as soon as an opportunity offers; but the Commander in Chief has it not in his power.

(Page 56, to Colonel GORDON). Do you know whether or not that Captain Maling ever joined and did duty with any regiment? *I do not know* that he did; and *I do not think that he did*.

"This case," adds the COURIER, "speaks so plainly for itself, that it requires no comment. Most surprising it is that Colonel Gordon has impressed many persons with an opinion of the great accuracy of his memory, and his rigid conformity to the rules of the service. Now, the Colonel's memory, poor man, seems as fallible as that of any other person who has been examined. During an examination into the undue promotion of the brother of Captain Maling of the War-Office, he does not know of any officer being promoted without any service whatever, though in a few minutes afterwards he owns he himself has lately recommended to be promoted to a Company, Maling's brother, a gentleman daily employed under him, *who never served in any Regiment whatever, or even joined one*. How unlucky that the man he had the most concern with in the world, (the Duke excepted) and whose brother's case was under consideration at the moment, should thus have slipped altogether out of his memory, though he, the Colonel, had lately recommended him for promotion, for lately it must be. And how unlucky that the Colonel, so very nice in enquiring into the qualifications of Officers *as to points of service* before he submits their names to the Duke, should himself have recommended a gentleman *who never served at all*! But let this military paragon take the advantage of his "errors excepted." If he cannot justify himself in the field of Mars, he has fortunately put in a saving clause which must secure his acquittal in "Change-alley." — This case alone gives us a pretty good view of the rigid

adherence, the inflexible adherence, to the rules laid down about promotion; and, whatever Sir Arthur Wellesley may think of it, it will weigh most lumpingly against any general assertion, founded upon the observation of any general in the army. —

But, let us take another case, containing a contrast; and though the facts may be dry in detail, they cannot fail to be useful.

FREDERICK ADAM (son of Mr. Wm. Adam) was an

	DATE.	AGE.
Ensign in the 26th Reg. of foot.	1797	- 14.
Lieut. in the same	- - - 1798	- 15.
Lieut. with rank of } Guards	1799	- 16.
Capt. ————— }		
Major in the 5th Bat. Reserve	1803	- 20.
Lt. Col. in the same	- - - 1804	- 21.
Lt. Col. in 21st foot	- - 1805	- 22.

Now, mark, reader; I beg you to mark it well; that Colonel Gordon says, that the rules of the service are, that an officer must serve SIX YEARS before he can be a field officer, that is to say, a Major, a Lt. Colonel or a Colonel; but, we here find, that Frederick Adam became a field officer in four years after he entered the army; at the age of 20 years; and that of these four years, a part, at least, according to his father's own statement, was spent, not in service, but at school. — No comment is necessary; but now let us see the contrast.

ANTHONY FRENCH, who was a captain in the 21st Reg. of foot, at the period when Frederick Adam entered the army and was put to school at Woolwich, is still a Captain, and, in that same regiment, is of course under the command of Frederick Adam.

FREDERICK JONES, } who were Lieutenants, in the 26th
J. G. FORTH, } foot, in 1798, at the
JAMES CONNOLLY, } time when Frederick Adam was a Lieutenant in that Regiment hold, at the present moment, the rank of Captain in that corps.
MONTAGUE WYNVARD, } who were senior
CHARLES PHILIPS, } Lieutenants, in the Coldstream Guards, to Frederick Adam, when the latter was serving with them, are Lieutenants in that Regiment still.

These facts have been stated to me, in a letter, in which I am referred to the army lists, published by authority. I have not those lists at hand; but if the statement be incorrect, the error can, at once, be rectified by a reference to those lists. — Now, then, what are we to think about the in-

bers has rendered it impossible to keep the army what it formerly was, either in point of morals, or of the size of the men. This I am willing to allow; but, really, when, on the one hand, I see the poor dirty looking things that now wear, after the German fashion, sashes twisted round them every day in the week; and, on the other hand, look back to the sergeants of 20 years ago, I am astonished to hear any one say that the army has *improved*. Still, I do allow, that it is quite impossible to have so large an army what the army was, and what it might be again if reduced to 30,000 men. I do not blame the Duke of York, because the army is not now what it then was; nor do I blame him because 12 or 15 thousand officers are not so select as 2 thousand officers were; but, I greatly blame his friends for endeavouring to make us believe, that the army formerly was bad, compared to what it is now, which I say is not the fact, and which, from the nature of things, cannot be the fact.—But, something has been said about the Duke having bettered the *condition* of the soldier. I have no wish to deny him a disposition to render the soldier's lot more comfortable, nor the merit of having taken a proper part in any measure of that sort; but, I believe, no one will deny, that the augmentation of pay was absolutely necessary to the bare existence of the men; the *time* when the augmentation took place must, too, not be forgotten; and, at any rate, the *means* came out of the pocket of the public and not of the Duke of York. Still, however, I do not wish to withhold from him any part of the praise due to this consideration for the then wretched state of the soldier; but, I must insist, and I am pretty sure, that the public will be of my opinion, that let who would have been the chief commander of the army, the pay, at the time referred to, must have been augmented, or that starvation, absolute starvation, would have driven the men from the ranks. Then, again, who will venture to assert, or to suppose, that what has been done for the comfort of the soldier, would not have been done under *any other* commander in chief? When the salaries of the Judges were augmented, did they receive the augmentation as a boon, as a *gift* from the *minister* of the day? No; but as an act of justice at the hands of the country; as something due to their services and their rank; as no more than a just compensation for the use of their great talents, and for their arduous and almost unremitted

labours. It is not at all agreeable to my notions, nor, I hope, to the notions either of those who pay, or those who receive, to look upon what is given in the way of augmentation to the income of any servant of the public, as a gift on the part of those, be they who they may, that propose, or support, the making of that augmentation.—Now, we come to a part of this evidence, which has some slight bearing upon the charges before the House, namely, what Sir Arthur Wellesley says about that “great and general satisfaction which the Duke has given as to matters of *promotion*, and about his inflexible adherence to the *rules* laid down relating to *promotions*.” This is all very well, but the worst of it is, that we have the cases of *Captain Maling* and of *Sammy Carter* before us; not in hearsay, not in assertion, but in *proof*. *Sammy* we will leave till another time; but, there is a part of Colonel Gordon's evidence (for reminding me of which I am obliged to some very acute and excellent remarks in the *Courier*) which we must here take particular notice of, as it will, in a twinkling, give us a most correct idea of all this boasted *regularity* and *inflexibility* about promotions.

(Page 47). Colonel GORDON says, I conceive it *my particular duty* to take care and report to the Commander in Chief, that any Officer whose name is submitted to his Royal Highness is a fit and proper person, duly qualified in all respects as to character, as to *points of service*, and as to his Majesty's regulations for the service into which he is so recommended.

It is a regulation of the army, his Majesty's regulation, that no Subaltern can be promoted *to a company*, either by purchase or *without*, under a *service* of two years.

(Page 49, he says) The regulations are briefly these: an officer must *serve* as a Subaltern two years before he can be a *Captain*, and he must have *served* six years before he can be a Field Officer. *I never knew an instance of those rules being broken through*, always, as in merchants accounts, saying *errors excepted*.

(Page 53, to Col. GORDON). Has it ever come within your knowledge, that any officer has been promoted *without any service* whatever? *No, it has not*.

(Page 55, to Col. GORDON). What were the *services* of Captain Maling's brother, who is, I believe, a Captain in the army, who is in the War Office? There is a Captain Maling, an assistant of mine in the Office of the Commander in Chief; I

take it
ferred
Lienten
him as
Comm
tion of
and mot
motions
hands, v
his Roy
Chief to
Captain
suredly
tunity
Chief h
(Pag
know w
ever jo
I do no
think: th
“Th
“so ph
“comm
“Colon
“perso
“racy
“mity
“Colon
“fallib
“has b
“natio
“broth
“Offic
“being
“ever,
“he o
“men
“Mali
“empl
“any
“How
“most
“Duke
“case
“ment
“ther
“Colo
“for
“And
“very
“tions
“fore
“shou
“tlem
“this
“of h
“not
“he h
“whic
“Cha
gives

take it for granted, that is the person referred to. What his services are as a Lieutenant, *I really do not know*; I found him as a Lieutenant in the Office of the Commander in Chief; and in consideration of his extraordinary good character, and more than common abilities, the promotions of the army going through his hands, under mine, *I did recommend him* to his Royal Highness the Commander in Chief to be placed upon the half-pay as a Captain, upon which half-pay *he most assuredly* will be placed as soon as an opportunity offers; but the Commander in Chief has it not in his power.

(Page 56, to Colonel GORDON). Do you know whether or not that Captain Malins ever joined and did duty with any regiment? *I do not know* that he did; and *I do not think* that he did.

"This case," adds the COURIER, "speaks so plainly for itself, that it requires no comment. Most surprising it is that Colonel Gordon has impressed many persons with an opinion of the great accuracy of his memory, and his rigid conformity to the rules of the service. Now, the Colonel's memory, poor man, seems as fallible as that of any other person who has been examined. During an examination into the undue promotion of the brother of Captain Malins of the War-Office, he does not know of any officer being promoted without any service whatever, though in a few minutes afterwards he owns he himself has lately recommended to be promoted to a Company, Malins's brother, a gentleman daily employed under him, *who never served in any Regiment whatever, or even joined one.* How unlucky that the man he had the most concern with in the world, (the Duke excepted) and whose brother's case was under consideration at the moment, should thus have slipped altogether out of his memory, though he, the Colonel, had lately recommended him for promotion, for lately it must be. And how unlucky that the Colonel, so very nice in enquiring into the qualifications of Officers as to points of service before he submits their names to the Duke, should himself have recommended a gentleman *who never served at all!* But let this military paragon take the advantage of his "errors excepted." If he cannot justify himself in the field of Mars, he has fortunately put in a saving clause which must secure his acquittal in "Change-alley." — This case alone gives us a pretty good view of the rigid

adherence, the inflexible adherence, to the rules laid down about promotion; and, whatever Sir Arthur Wellesley may think of it, it will weigh most lumpingly against any general assertion, founded upon the observation of any general in the army. —

But, let us take another case, containing a contrast; and though the facts may be dry in detail, they cannot fail to be useful.

FREDERICK ADAM (son of Mr. Wm. Adam) was an

	DATE.	AGE.
Ensign in the 26th Reg. of foot.	1797	- 14.
Lieut. in the same	- - -	1798 - 15.
Lieut. with rank of } Guards	1799	- 16.
Capt. ————— }		
Major in the 5th Bat. Reserve	1803	- 20.
Lt. Col. in the same	- - -	1804 - 21.
Lt. Col. in 21st foot	- - -	1805 - 22.

Now, mark, reader; I beg you to mark it well; that Colonel Gordon says that the rules of the service are, that an officer must serve SIX YEARS before he can be a field officer, that is to say, a Major, a Lt. Colonel or a Colonel; but, we here find, that Frederick Adam became a field officer in four years after he entered the army; at the age of 20 years; and that of these four years, a part, at least, according to his father's own statement, was spent, not in service, but at school. — No comment is necessary; but now let us see the contrast.

ANTHONY FRENCH, who was a captain in the 21st Reg. of foot, at the period when Frederick Adam entered the army and was put to school at Woolwich, is still a Captain, and, in that same regiment, is of course under the command of Frederick Adam.

FREDERICK JONES, } who were Lieutenants, in the 26th
J. G. FORTH, } foot, in 1798, at the
JAMES CONNOLLY, } time when Frederick Adam was a Lieutenant in that Regiment hold, at the present moment, the rank of Captain in that corps.
MONTAGUE WYNYARD, } who were senior
CHARLES PHILIPS, } Lieutenants, in the Coldstream Guards, to Frederick Adam, when the latter was serving with them, are Lieutenants in that Regiment still.

These facts have been stated to me, in a letter, in which I am referred to the army lists, published by authority. I have not those lists at hand; but if the statement be incorrect, the error can, at once, be rectified by a reference to those lists. — Now, then, what are we to think about the in-

flexible adherence to the rules of promotion? What are we to think about that "general satisfaction," which we are told, that the Duke's management of promotions has given?—I am of opinion, and so must, I think, every reasonable man, that a strict rule of promotion by *seniority* would be a very bad rule; that it would damp all emulation; and that little that is brilliant, daring, glorious, could be expected in such a service. But, then, seniority must be a *rule*, and a departure from it the *exception*; else all would be mere favour, caprice, and intrigue. That there ought to be the *power* of departing from the rule we all allow; reason says it should be so; but, then, reason, united with justice, say, that this power never should be exercised, except in cases where the *good of the service* demands such exercise; and, in cases, too, where that demand is so obvious that there can be *no doubt* upon the point. *Length of service* is, of itself, a military merit; such it has always been deemed; and it has been a rule to reward accordingly. When, therefore, there exists no particular, no special and *obvious* reason for preferring one man to another, the rule of seniority ought to be strictly adhered to. Now, in the case of Frederick Adam, to say nothing about his rank and promotion, while *at school*, there does not appear any such special and obvious reason for a preference. His father says, he behaved very bravely and skilfully in Holland at the age of 16 years; but, will he pretend to say, that there were not many other officers, his seniors, whose good conduct was not equal to his? No, no; it is not on account of an act of *ordinary* merit, that will warrant a departure from the rule of seniority. Had it, indeed, fallen to the lot of Frederick Adam to go, as we see Lord Cochrane has done (and which, had the occasion offered, I have no doubt he would), into the ditch of a rampart, and, amidst a shower of balls, bring up the flag of the fortress, and again set it flying defiance against the enemy; had a case of this sort occurred, the whole army would have seen the rule of seniority departed from, not only without pain, but with pleasure. But no such case appears to have existed; we never till now heard of any extraordinary merit in the son of Mr. Adam; most of us never heard of his name before; nay, for my own part, I am amongst those, who did not know that Mr. Adam had a son in the army. Besides, we see Frederick Adam, not only promoted over the heads of his

seniors, at the out-set, and in one regiment; but, we see him going from corps to corps, and we see his good fortune still follow him, wherever he goes; we see him still and still jumping over the heads of his seniors.—It must, I think, be manifest to every man, that such preferences cannot fail to be greatly injurious to the service. When officers see their juniors get the start of them, without any such claim as I have before described, it is impossible, decidedly impossible, that their zeal should not be damped; that they should not have a cold heart for the service; and that, in the end, they should not care to have any care beyond that of mere self. This is so obvious, and there are so many thoughts connected with it, which will, at once, strike the reader, that I shall not longer dwell upon it.—I do not know whether it occurred to any body else, but to me it immediately did, upon reading General Fitzpatrick's evidence, in praise of the Duke of York's commandership, to express a wish to know, according to what "*rule of promotion*" it was, that the General, who had not been in any *military* service, I believe, for above 20 years, and who, I believe, had not actually served since he was a *Captain* in the Guards, came to have a *Regiment* given to him, the moment Mr. Fox and his party came into place, in 1806. We see, that in the case of Major Brooke, a stoppage of the proposed exchange took place, the Major having been upon *half pay* for six years. This circumstance required an inquiry, one of Colonel Gordon's inquiries. The Colonel does not (what a pity!) keep any *minutes* of his inquiries, or I should certainly be for asking him to oblige us with a copy of the *inquiry*, made with respect to General Fitzpatrick, who had, for so many years, I believe a full *quarter of a century*, been, not upon half pay, but upon no pay at all, at least, I mean, as an officer in the army. Perhaps, if we were to search through the whole of the army list, we should not find a more complete instance of the excellent arrangements at the Commander-in-Chief's office, than this instance of the promotion of General Fitzpatrick. It is notorious; it is a thing not to be denied by any one, that he had, for many years, been living in and about London, with not the smallest appearance of any thing military about him, with the sole exception of the rank prefixed to his name; nor have I ever heard, that he ever actually served, either abroad or at home, except in the Guards, as far as the rank

of Ca
into t
Fox w
and t
This
good
comp
so go
he ca
signe
good
and t
in th
12 to
have
regin
yet,
we a
the v
prom
the r
adhe
as to
"gen
natio
muc
think
to th
of th
nag
will
the
char
own
proc
bro
sup
usel

V
not
the
wit
we
fect
cha
Off
as
bec
up
the
ver
off
pa
fou
shi
in
of
re
off
an

of Captain. And yet, he not only came into the army all at once, as soon as Mr. Fox was in office, but had the Colonelcy and the *profits* of a regiment given to him. This is not for *life*, indeed; it is not so good as a patent place, which has been compared to a freehold estate; it is not so good as that, because, if the king pleases, he can, at any time, without reason assigned, *take the regiment away*. But, it is a good thing, as long as the General has it; and the reader will readily suppose, that, in the whole of our army, containing from 12 to 15 thousand officers, a person *might* have been found with *as good* claims to a regiment as General Fitzpatrick.—And yet, we are desired; in the face of all this, we are desired to believe, that nothing in the world can be better managed than the promotions of the army have been; that the rules of promotion are most religiously adhered to; and that the Duke's conduct, as to promotions, in particular, have given "*general satisfaction*." We are a *believing* nation. There is hardly any thing too much for us in this way. But, I really do think, that our belief is not quite equal to this.—After all, however, the conduct of the Duke of York, in the general management of the army, has, the reader will clearly see, nothing at all to do with the *specific Charges* against him. Those charges must stand, or fall, upon their own merits; and, unless the Duke can produce *evidence* to rebut the evidence brought against him, all the efforts of his supporters, in any other way, are perfectly useless.

We now come to a matter, which, though not relating to any of the charges against the Duke of York, is so nearly connected with them as never to be lost sight of when we are making observations, as to the effects of the transactions stated in those charges.—I allude to the *general traffic for Offices and Places under Government*, which, as the reader will remember, has before been a subject of observation with me, upon many occasions. At page 181 of the present volume, I inserted several advertisements relating to the sale of such offices and places, and, in the half-month's papers, from which I collected them, I found one for a *Writership*, one for a *Cadetship*, and several relating to commissions in the *Militia*; but, as no money was spoken of in the latter case, I did not insert it, and really, as to the East India sovereigns' offices, I thought they were *always* bought and sold; and how should I think other-

wise, when I saw, in the course of every year, so many hundreds of advertisements like those here spoken of; nor was it without the most agreeable surprize, that, when Mr. Donovan's disclosure came forth, I found that the East India Directors took the thing to heart, and called for "*a committee, up-stairs*," to inquire into "*so serious a matter*." This was a most agreeable surprize to me, who had seen their offices advertised for sale for so many years, without one word having ever been said against such advertisements, or such sale.

—As to the offices and places under the government of this country, I had, more than once, and a long while ago, taken advertisements, relating to them, for *mottos* to my Register; and, in one Number, having such a motto, I appealed to Mr. Perceval, whether such things were proper; whether they were not calculated to disgust the country; and I asked him *why the authors were not prosecuted*.—This statement, intended to refresh the mind of the reader, is by way of preface to the very curious matter that came out in the House of Commons, from the lips of Mr. Perceval, on the 24th of February, relating to a prosecution of that sort, which was so long ago recommended by me.—He, the report of the proceedings says, "*informed the House, that although he had taken the address of the house in Thread-needle-street, from the hon. gentleman, (Mr. Wardle), who alluded to it in opening his charge against the Duke of York, as if he (Mr. Perceval) had been a stranger to its existence, yet that he was perfectly aware of the circumstance at that time. The reason of his pretending ignorance, on the subject, was owing to this:—A gentleman had written to him on the 12th January, stating, that on reading an advertisement for the sale of an office under Government, he had answered it to the persons who kept this office, and was then in treaty for it. He was sent to the Solicitor of the Treasury, who had instructions to furnish any sum of money necessary for a deposit, and to proceed in the business till the parties were entrapped beyond the possibility of escaping the law. The business was in this state at the time the hon. gentleman had brought forward his charges, and he thought it imprudent to appear as if at all acquainted with the subject. An indictment was now filed against Messrs. Pullen and Haylock, and a Lady of the name of Harvey, as well as against the Banker (Watson, it afterwards ap-*

“peared) who received the deposit.—“From what he had said, it would be seen “that Government had determined to inquire “into and proceed against these abuses a considerable time before the hon. gentleman “brought the subject of inquiry before the “House.”—Oh! no, no, no!—No, no! Not “a considerable time.” Mr. Wardle brought forward his charges on the 27th of January; but, he gave notice of his intention so to do about a week before that. Well, this leaves but eight days between Mr. Perceval’s receiving “the gentleman’s” letter, and the notice of Mr. Wardle, which notice, observe, must, in this case, be coupled with the threat of Mrs. Clarke, sent to Mr. Adam so long ago as the month of June last. *Eight days* is not what we mean by a “considerable time,” in such cases; nor must we allow Mr. Wardle thus to be deprived of this part of the effect of his exertions.—Besides, though Mr. Perceval got the “gentleman’s” letter (Mr. Wardle always mentioned names) on the 12th of January, it does not follow, that he set the Solicitor of the Treasury to work before Mr. Wardle gave notice of a motion. This does not follow; and, if I had been one of the House, I would have called for names, dates, and papers of all sorts.—The great object, in this most curious movement, evidently was, to cause the public to believe, that the government was, of itself, disposed to put a stop to these shameful transactions, and that it would have done it, if Mr. Wardle had never been born; and, the proof is, that it had actually set to work, even before his notice of any charges was given.—To believe this, we must also believe that there has been a very wonderful concurrence; a wonderful jumping of judgment. Yes, we must believe; it does not signify talking about “a gentleman’s” letter; we must believe it to be very strange indeed, that, just at this time, the government should have taken the first, the very first step, in the detection and punishment of those who buy and sell offices and places; and that an advertisement, too, should set them to work, though thousands of such advertisements have appeared, during the last 10 or 15 years. Very strange, indeed!—But, though Mr. Wardle did not give his notice till the 20th of January, or thereabouts, will Mr. Perceval say, that he did not hear of Mr. Wardle’s intention so to do, long before the 20th or even the famous 12th of January? Will he say, that he did not hear of this? I did. I heard

of it in the first week of January, and, I believe, on the 2nd day of the month; and the intention, as being publicly rumoured, was mentioned to me in a letter, the day after my return home, which was on the 9th of January. Nay, must it not have been known to the ministers before the 12th of January? Must not this have been the case, from the inquiries of Mr. Wardle? He says, that he had been about a month at work to get at his facts; and, will any one believe, that the ministers were not well acquainted with all his movements? Aye, from the first or second day of them, at the latest. The moment Mr. Wardle began his inquiries, the whole gang of jobbers would, of course, be in alarm, and like a nest of hornets, disturbed by the intrusion of the spade, would begin to fly about, in all directions. Such a thing could not be kept secret for half an hour; and, are we, good souls as we are, to believe, that the ministers would be the last to hear of it?—Now, then, let us look back again at what this very Mr. Perceval said in the Debate, the ever-memorable Debate, of the 27th of January, which see at page 201 of this volume. Having read that passage, having recollected the “loud and general laugh,” which the House set up, when they heard Mr. Wardle’s description of the office in Threadneedle Street; and having also called to mind the scoffs, which, on account of this part of his statement, the ministerial papers, and particularly the Nabobs’ Gazette, uttered against Mr. Wardle; having thus refreshed his memory, the reader will be the better able to judge, whether the prosecution, now mentioned by Mr. Perceval, would ever have taken place had it not been for Mr. Wardle’s most admirable conduct.—Again. As Mr. Perceval was in possession of such facts, before Mr. Wardle brought forward his charges, how came Mr. Perceval to speak, generally, as to that gentleman’s charges, as he did? Might not one have reasonably expected to hear him, who was in possession of such facts, speak more on Mr. Wardle’s side, and not oppose him in his mode of inquiry, not hold the language of defiance, language calculated to throw discredit upon all that Mr. Wardle said?—It remains to be accounted for, too, why this acknowledgment of the ministers, as to the existence of the traffic, was kept back ‘till after the inquiry was over,’ till after such damning proofs had been produced? This is a very important circumstance. Being in pos-

session of such facts, one would have expected to hear Mr. Perceval taking the first opportunity to state them, and to acknowledge that Mr. Wardle had but too good grounds for his statement respecting the Threadneedle Street Office. But, on the contrary, Mr. Wardle had to go through the whole inquiry, with the *denial*, the flat *denial*, against him, that the ministers knew any thing of any such practices.—The concise view of the matter is this: That Advertisements, for the purchase and sale of offices and places under government, have appeared, in all the News-papers, for many years past, to the number of many hundreds in every year, with as much boldness as the advertisements for Mr. Packwood's razor strops, or Doctor Spilsbury's drops;—that, more than a year ago, and more than once, I took such advertisements for my motto, and, in an essay, or in essays, upon the subject, called upon Mr. Perceval himself, to know why such offences were not punished by law;—that it now appears, that the government has always had the power of punishing such acts by law;—that no such punishment, and that no prosecution for any such offence, has ever taken place, nor have we ever heard, that the government has ever made any inquiry into the matter;—that in *June*, 1808, Mrs. Clarke sends letters to Mr. Adam, threatening an exposure of her practices under the Duke of York;—that in *December*, or in the first days of *January* last, Mr. Wardle sets to work making inquiries, as to the practices of Mrs. Clarke, and as to the practices of other dealers in offices and places under government;—that, on the 20th of January, Mr. Wardle gives notice of a motion respecting the Duke of York;—that, on the 27th of January he brings forward his charges against the Duke, and states, at the same time, that there is an office in Threadneedle Street for the sale of offices and places under government:—that Mr. Perceval (*one of the king's ministers*) treats this statement in a manner whence it appears that he discredits the existence of such practices;—that Mr. Wardle, between the 27th of January and the 23rd of February, pursues his charges against the Duke, and produces *undeniable proof* of the existence of such practices to a great extent;—that, *after all this*, and on the 24th of February, out comes Mr. Perceval with information to the House, that he knew of such practices *on the 12th of January*, that the parties in one instance, are under prosecution by the

government, that the preparation for this prosecution was going on before Mr. Wardle brought forward his charges, and that he (Mr. Perceval), on the 27th of January, "*pretended ignorance*" of such practices, only for the purpose of keeping from the parties any suspicion of the measures that were taking to *entrap* them.—From these propositions; this chain of undeniable facts, the reader will easily decide, whether the prosecution, now said to be undertaken, has proceeded purely from the disposition of the government to punish such infamous practices; or whether it has proceeded from a desire, on the part of the government, to save itself from the effects of a suspicion that it had participated in, or, at least, winked at, such practices, and that it never would have attempted to put a stop to them, had it not been for Mr. Wardle.—This question the reader will easily decide, and, as he must be convinced, that it is a question of great importance, I trust the decision will remain *deeply imprinted on his mind*. It must be, I think, clear to every man of only common discernment, that what is now going on, must, sooner or later, lead to momentous events. To, I hope and trust, a great, a radical, and a salutary change; a change that shall *destroy* no branch of our excellently formed government, but that shall *renovate* them all. The great misfortune of other governments has been, that, while the *higher* classes have "*indulged*," as Burke calls it, "*in all their vicious humours*," the *second class* have been, by one tie or another, induced to remain in inactivity, and that, at last, the work of reform has fallen to the hands of the *lower* class; and, then, need we wonder at the wild work they have made? That we now stand in need of reform, there is no man, not even a trading Anti-Jacobin, will attempt to deny. That a reform must and will come, is, I think, as evident; and, is it not, then, the duty of persons in the *middling* rank of life to act in such a manner as to prevent the danger of this work of reform falling into the hands of those, who cannot be supposed capable of managing it well? To talk of a love of country is as easy as to talk of any thing else. The country calls for *deeds*, not *words*. The excuses of her professed lovers are exactly those made by the Calf, to "*THE HARE WITH MANY FRIENDS*."

"Older and abler pass you by;

"How strong are those! How weak am I!"

"Should I *présume* to hear you hence,
 "Those friends of mine might take offence.
 "Excuse me, then,—You know my *heart*;
 "But dearest friends, alas! must part.
 "How shall we all lament! Adieu!
 "For, see, the hounds are just in view."

But, to the coldness of the *Calf's* friendship (to give it the mildest term) we, if we remain inert, add the grossest of folly; because in the fate of the country, our own fate is inextricably involved. Evils, when taken in time, are deprived of half their mischievous qualities. Yet, though this is so manifestly the time for the people to beseech the king to adopt such measures as shall effectually guard them, in future, against the effects of a system of corruption like that which now stands exposed before them, not a county, not a city, not a town, not a village, not a single man do we see bestir himself. The whole population of the kingdom seem to stand by as unconcerned spectators; or, at best, to discover little more than mere curiosity; and this, too, at a moment, when, by a constitutional exercise of their rights, their opinions, the opinions which they all entertain, respectfully but plainly expressed, might, and would, speedily produce a reform equally advantageous to their sovereign and themselves, and hurtful to none but the domestic and foreign foes of their happiness and of their country's independence.—It was not thus that our forefathers acted towards us; and it is not thus that we ought to act towards our children.

Botley, Thursday, 2 March, 1809.

TO THE READER.

BEING under the necessity of raising the price of this publication, from *ten-pence* to *one shilling*, I beg leave to state the grounds, upon which, after long hesitation, I, at last, reluctantly do it.—When the work was begun I paid *twenty-four* shillings a ream for the paper; I now pay *forty-three* shillings a ream; and, it is well known, that printers' work has greatly augmented in price since that time.—Of the *ten-pence*, at present received, *three-pence half-penny* goes, in advance, for the stamp, the discount upon which is scarcely sufficient to meet the loss from torn stamps, to say nothing of the *unsold numbers*; the paper costs more than a *penny*, allowing nothing for torn paper; to the news-man the allowance is *two-pence*. Here is *sixpence half-penny* out of the *ten-pence*, leaving only *three-pence half-penny* for printing, for

torn paper, for unsold Numbers, for portage, for carriage of paper, for postage, for a salary to the publisher, for warehouse-room, for divers other expences, which cannot easily be stated, but which amount to a great sum in the course of the year; so that, in the end, I have not, for my constant and infinite labour, nearly one-half so much left, as, with the same application, I could gain in various other ways.—The daily news-papers are, indeed, sold for *sixpence*, and the printing of them is still more expensive. The same may be said of all the weekly news-papers. But, then, look at their *Advertisements*, which, in some of those papers, amount frequently, to forty or fifty pounds a day. Three shillings from each advertisement is taken in *tax*; but, the insertion of the smallest advertisement is, I believe, charged at six shillings; and, if it be charged at a guinea or two guineas, the tax is still but three shillings. Indeed, if it were not for this gain upon the advertisements, and for certain paragraphs, the insertion of which is paid for, a daily paper never could stand. There is *three-pence half-penny* for the stamp, a *penny* for the paper, and a *penny* for the news-man; so that there is a *half-penny* left to pay for printing; to pay the Editor, who cannot have less than nine or ten pounds a week; to pay four, five, or six gentlemen for reporting debates, at the rate of about five guineas a week each, all the year round; to pay for a large house, necessarily in the most expensive part of London; to pay for foreign news-papers, which, if I am not mistaken, cost each of the principal daily papers from two to three hundred pounds a year; to pay for postage; to pay numerous other even heavy charges, which it would tire the reader to enumerate; and, at last, to leave the proprietor, necessarily a man of talent and enterprize, a compensation for his time and for the use of his capital, to say nothing of what he has sunk in rearing the establishment.—From this statement, though a very defective representation of the expences, the reader will, at once, see, that the stamp, which has gone on rising from a halfpenny to three-pence half-penny, would amount to a *complete prohibition* against the printing of a daily paper at sixpence, were it not for the advertisements, which, by-the-bye, no paper is sure of obtaining.—Of all the things that are taxed, nothing is so heavily taxed as this sort of periodical publications. The tax is paid, too, upon the nail, even before the article is made fit for sale. But

atill the tax is, in proportion, heavier upon me (who have no part of my matter, the insertion of which is *paid for*) than it is upon the proprietors of daily papers. My work is, in fact, *not a news-paper*; nor has it any of the lucrative qualities of a news-paper; the nature of its matter would exempt it from the news-paper stamp, but then, without the stamp, it could not be circulated by means of the post-office.—The stamp-office allows the daily papers a discount of £.16 per cent. for *torn and unsold* Numbers; while it allows me but £.4. 18s. per cent. the reason of which has never appeared to me, seeing that, from the very nature of my work, it is evident that I must lose more than the daily papers by unsold Numbers. A daily paper, when it finds its edition too small, can repeat the interesting matter the next day; but, I am obliged to print an *over number*; because the time for the repeating is at too great a distance.—I do not complain of this tax, as a tax; for, though it certainly tends to lessen the power of the press, it is one of those taxes, the manner of levying which does not trench upon a man's personal freedom; but, I have always thought, and I still think, that my publication, in proportion to what is received for each sheet, is, beyond all measure, more heavily taxed than the daily and weekly news-papers, each of which contains so much of value in their advertisements and paid-for paragraphs; and I also think, that even in a mere fiscal point of view, the stamp upon *all* the news-papers is impolitically high. At the same time I think it right to say, that, during the six years that I have carried on this publication, I have never met with any thing annoying, in any department of the Stamp-Office; and that, as often as I have had any thing to do with the Commissioners, I have never found them, under any ministry, disposed to put me to any inconvenience, and that, upon a recent occasion, I have had to acknowledge their indulgence.—Of the *two-pence*, now to be added to the price of the Register, a *half-penny* will go in additional allowance to the *news-men*, who, when their labour and their house-rent and their credit are all duly considered, have not too much allowed them. The wonder is, indeed, how they can make the business answer; and it is only that incessant application to business, to be found no where but amongst London tradesmen, that could possibly secure a profit from such a trade.—Such

are the grounds, upon which I make the proposed rise in the price of this work, which rise will begin with the Number that will be published *on the 18th of March*, in order to afford time to gentlemen, who live in the country, to discontinue the work, if they should be disposed to do it on account of the augmentation of price. The step has been taken by me with great reluctance; but, I am persuaded, that there are few persons, who are indulgent enough to set a value upon the effects of my labour, would wish that that labour should go without something like an adequate compensation.

✎ It has been stated to Mr. Budd of Pall Mall, who has sent the statement to me, that "*the Marchioness of Stafford has no pension, and never had any*;" and that it is supposed, that the error, in my statement, arose from the *late* Marchioness having had a pension, as Lady of the Bed-chamber to the *Duchess of Brunswick*. I really do not see why the *people of England* ought to have paid a pension on such an account; but, as to the fact, there is no error in *my* statement, as will appear from the following extract, under the head of pensions per annum, as they stood on the 5th January, 1807. "*Gower, Countess, now Marchioness of Stafford, £.300.*"—See the Report, laid before parliament, in June 1808, page 134.

OFFICIAL PAPERS.

SPANISH REVOLUTION.—*Twenty-seventh Bulletin of the French Army of Spain, continued from page 320.*

—The English army suffers considerably; it has no longer ammunition and baggage, and half the English cavalry is on foot. Since our departure from Benevente up to the 5th instant, we counted on the road 1800 English horses, that had been killed.—The remains of Romana's army are found wandering about in all directions, the remains of the army of Majorca, of Ibernica, of Barcelona, and of Naples, are made prisoners.—General Maupetet having come up with, on the side of Zamora, with his brigade of dragoons, a column of 800 men, charged and dispersed them, and killed or took the greater part.—The Spanish peasantry of Galicia and Leon, have no mercy on the English. Notwithstanding the strictest orders to the contrary, we every day find a number of English assassinated.—The head-quarters of the duke of Elchingen are at Villa Franca, on the confines of

Galicia and Leon. The duke of Belluno is on the Tagus. The whole of the imperial guard is concentrated at Valladolid. The cities of Valladolid, of Palencia, Segovia, Avilla, Astorga, Leon, &c. have sent numerous deputations to the King.—The flight of the English army, the dispersion of the remains of the armies of Romana and Estramadura, and the evils which the troops of the different armies inflict upon the country, rally the provinces round the legitimate authority. The city of Madrid has particularly distinguished itself;—28,500 heads of families have taken the oath of allegiance upon the holy Sacrament. The citizens have promised his Imperial Majesty, that if he will place his brother on the throne, they will serve him with all their efforts, and defend him with all their means.

Twenty-Eighth Bulletin, dated, Valladolid, Jan. 13.

The part of the treasure of the enemy which has fallen into our hands is 1,800,000 francs.—The inhabitants assert that the English have carried off from eight to ten millions.—The English general deeming it impossible that the French infantry and artillery should have followed him, and gained upon him a certain number of marches, particularly in mountains so difficult as those of Galicia, thought he could only be pursued by cavalry and sharpshooters. He took therefore the position of Castro on his right, supported by the river Tombago, which passes by Lugo, and is not fordable.—The duke of Dalmatia arrived on the 6th in presence of the enemy. He employed the seventh and eighth in reconnoitring the enemy, and collecting his infantry and artillery, which were still in the rear. He formed his plan of attack. The left only of the enemy was attackable; he manœuvred on their left. His dispositions required some movements on the 8th, the Duke being determined to attack on the 9th; but the enemy retreated in the night, and in the morning our advanced guard entered Lugo. The enemy left 300 sick in the hospitals; a park of 18 pieces of cannon, and 300 waggons of ammunition. We made 700 prisoners.—The town and environs of Lugo are choaked with the bodies of English horses. Hence, upwards of 2500 horses have been killed in the retreat.

The weather is dreadful; rain and snow fall continually.—The English are marching to Corunna in great haste, where they have 400 transports. They have already lost baggage, ammunition, a part even of their most material artillery, and upwards of 3000 prisoners. On the 10th our advanced guard was at Betanzos, a short distance from Corunna. The duke of Elchingen is with his corps near Lugo.—In reckoning the sick, stragglers, those who have been killed by the peasants, and made prisoners by our troops, we may calculate the loss of the English at one third of their army. They are reduced to 18,000 men, and are not yet embarked. From Sahagun they retreated 150 leagues in bad weather, worse roads, through mountains, and always closely pursued at the point of the sword.—It is difficult to conceive the folly of their plan of campaign. It must be attributed not to the general who commands, and who is a clever and skilful man, but to that spirit of hatred and rage which animates the English Ministry. To push forward in this manner 30,000 men, exposing them to destruction, or to flight as their only resource, is a conception which can only be inspired by the spirit of passion, or the most extravagant presumption. (*To be continued.*)

COBBETT'S COMPLETE COLLECTION OF State Trials:

To be completed in Thirty-Six Monthly Parts, forming Twelve large Volumes in Royal Octavo.

The THIRD PART of the above Work was published on Wednesday, the first of March. One Part will appear, with the greatest regularity, on the first of each succeeding Month. Those Subscribers who have expressed their intention of taking the Work in Quarterly Volumes, are respectfully informed that the First Volume is now ready for delivery.

COBBETT'S Parliamentary Debates:

The TWELFTH VOLUME is in the Press. All Communications for the above Work, if sent to the Publishers in due time, shall be carefully attended to.